arXiv:1006.5143v1 [math.NT] 26 Jun 2010

ON THE UNRAMIFIED EXTENSION OF AN ARITHMETIC FUNCTION FIELD IN SEVERAL VARIABLES

FENG-WEN AN

Abstract. In this paper we will give a scheme-theoretic discussion on the unramified extensions of an arithmetic function field in several variables. The notion of unramified discussed here is parallel to that in algebraic number theory and for the case of classical varieties, coincides with that in Lang's theory of unramified class fields of a function field in several variables. It is twofold for us to introduce the notion of unramified. One is for the computation of the étale fundamental group of an arithmetic scheme; the other is for an ideal-theoretic theory of unramified class fields over an arithmetic function field in several variables. Fortunately, in the paper we will also have operations on unramified extensions such as base changes, composites, subfields, transitivity, etc. It will be proved that a purely transcendental extension over the rational field has a trivial unramified extension. As an application, it will be seen that the affine scheme of a ring over the ring of integers in several variables has a trivial étale fundamental group.

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Basic Definitions
3. Operations on Unramified Extensions
4. Unramified Extensions of a Purely Transcendental Extension
5. An Application to the Étale Fundamental Group
References

1. Introduction

In this paper we will discuss the unramified extensions of an arithmetic function field, i.e., a function field over $\mathbb{Z}$ in several variables. When restricted to classical varieties, the notion of unramified discussed here coincides with that in Lang's theory of unramified class fields of a function field in several variables (see [7]).

In deed, it is twofold for us to introduce the notion of unramified extensions of an arithmetic function field in a scheme-theoretic manner. One is for the computation of the étale fundamental group of an arithmetic scheme (see §5 in the paper or see [1, 2] for a general case). The other is for one to try to have an ideal-theoretic theory of unramified class fields over an arithmetic function field in several variables (for instance, see [3]).

The notion of unramified for arithmetic function fields discussed in the paper is parallel to that in algebraic number theory (for instance, see [9]). In fact, let K be

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11G35; Secondary 14F35, 14G25.
Key words and phrases. arithmetic function field, arithmetically unramified, étale fundamental group.

an arithmetic function field, i.e., K is the fractional field of a ring of the form

$$\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n, s_1, s_2, \cdots, s_m]$$

where $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$ are algebraic independent variables over $\mathbb{Q}$ and $s_1, s_2, \cdots, s_m$ are algebraic over the field $\mathbb{Q}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]$. As a counterpart in algebraic number theory, the ring of algebraic integers of the field K, denoted by $\mathcal{O}_K$, is also defined to be the set of elements $x \in K$ that are integral over the ring $\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]$.

Let $L \supseteq K$ be an arithmetic function field also over variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$. Then L is unramified over K if the scheme $Spec(\mathcal{O}_L)$ is unramified over $Spec(\mathcal{O}_K)$ by the morphism induced from the inclusion map $K \hookrightarrow L$. It will be seen that the unramified is independent of the choice of variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$. See §2 for details.

Fortunately, there also exist the same operations on unramified extensions of arithmetic function fields as in algebraic number theory (see [9]), such as base changes, composites, subfields, transitivity, etc. See §3 for details.

In §4 we will prove that a purely transcendental extension $\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)$ has a trivial unramified extension. As an immediate application, in §5 it will be seen that $Spec(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n])$ has a trivial étale fundamental group, i.e.,

$$\pi_1^{et}(Spec(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n])) = \{0\}.$$

Acknowledgment. The author would like to express his sincere gratitude to Professor Li Banghe for his advice and instructions on algebraic geometry and topology.

2. Basic Definitions

Let's recall basic definitions for arithmetically unramified extensions of a function field over $\mathbb{Z}$ in several variables that are introduced in [2], where the maximal arithmetically unramified extension will be used to give a computation of the étale fundamental group of an arithmetic scheme (see §5).

2.1. **Convention.** In the paper, an **arithmetic function field over variables** $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$ is the fractional field $K = Fr(D)$ of an integral domain

$$D = \mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n, s_1, s_2, \cdots, s_m]$$

of finite type over $\mathbb{Z}$, where

$$s_1, s_2, \cdots, s_m$$

are algebraic over $\mathbb{Q}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]$ and

$$t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n,$$

are (algebraic independent) variables over $\mathbb{Q}$.

2.2. **Ring of algebraic integers in an arithmetic function field.** Let K be an arithmetic function field over variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$. As a counterpart in algebraic number theory, put

- $\mathcal{O}_{[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]K} \triangleq$ the subring of elements $x \in K$ that are integral over the integral domain $\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]$.

The ring $\mathcal{O}_{[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]K}$ is said to be the **ring of algebraic integers** of K **over variables** $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$. Sometimes, we will write

$$\mathcal{O}_K = \mathcal{O}_{[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]K}$$

for brevity.

Proposition 2.1. We have $K = Fr(\mathcal{O}_K)$.

Proof. Let $F = \mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)$. Take an $s = s_j$ with $1 \leq j \leq m$ in the above. As s is algebraic over F, there is a polynomial $f(X) \in F[X]$ such that $f(s) = 0$. Without loss of generality, suppose

$$f(X) = a_n X^n + a_{n-1} X^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 X + a_0$$

such that each coefficient a_i of $f(X)$ is contained in $\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]$.

Let $a_n \neq 0$. We have

$$(a_n s)^n + a_{n-1}(a_n s)^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0 a_n^{n-1} = 0.$$

Then $a_n s \in \mathcal{O}_K$; hence, $K = Fr(\mathcal{O}_K)$. □

2.3. **Arithmetically unramified.** Let K and L be two arithmetic function fields over variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$. We say

$$(L, \mathcal{O}_L) \supseteq (K, \mathcal{O}_K)$$

if and only if there are

$$\overline{K} \supseteq L \supseteq K;$$
$$\mathcal{O}_L \supseteq \mathcal{O}_K \supseteq \mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n].$$

Definition 2.2. Let L/K be arithmetic function fields over variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$. L is **arithmetically unramified** over K (**relative to variables** $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$) if for the pairs $(L, \mathcal{O}_L) \supseteq (K, \mathcal{O}_K)$, the affine scheme $Spec(\mathcal{O}_L)$ is unramified over $Spec(\mathcal{O}_K)$ by the morphism induced from the inclusion map $K \hookrightarrow L$.

It will be seen that the arithmetically unramified extension L/K is independent of the choice of variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$ (see *Remark 3.6* below).

Remark 2.3. These arithmetically unramified extensions coincide exactly with those in algebraic number theory (for instance, see [8, 9]).

3. Operations on Unramified Extensions

As in algebraic number theory, in this section we will have several operations on arithmetically unramified extensions. It will be seen that such unramified extensions are transitive and that the base changes, the composites, and the subfields are still arithmetically unramified. A part of the results in the section are discussed in [2] in an not obvious manner.

Here, the approach to arithmetically unramified, which is in a scheme-theoretic manner, is still valid for number fields; at the same time, in algebraic number theory, these results on number fields are obtained essentially from *Hemsel's Lemma* (for instance, see [9]).

3.1. **Subfields and transitivity.** Let $K \subseteq L \subseteq M$ be arithmetic function fields over variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let L/K and M/L be arithmetically unramified, respectively. Then so is M/L.*

Proof. It is immediate from the composite of two unramified morphisms is also unramified (see [6, 8]). □

Lemma 3.2. *Let L be arithmetically unramified over K. Take a subfield $L \subseteq L_0 \subseteq K$. Then L/L_0 and L_0/K are arithmetically unramified, respectively.*

Proof. For the rings of algebraic integers, we have

$$\mathcal{O}_K \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{L_0} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_L;$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{L_0} = \mathcal{O}_L \bigcap L_0;$$

$$\mathcal{O}_K = \mathcal{O}_L \bigcap K = \mathcal{O}_{L_0} \bigcap K.$$

Fixed any prime ideal $\mathfrak{P}$ of the ring $\mathcal{O}_L$. Put

$$\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{P} \bigcap \mathcal{O}_K;$$

$$\mathfrak{P}_0 = \mathfrak{P} \bigcap \mathcal{O}_{L_0}.$$

Then $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{P}_0$ are prime ideals of $\mathcal{O}_K$ and $\mathcal{O}_{L_0}$, respectively.

By the assumption that L/K is arithmetically unramified, it is seen that

$$\mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}_L$$

holds and that

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}_L/\mathfrak{P}}{\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p}}$$

is a finite separable extension (see [5, 6, 8]). It follows that

$$\mathfrak{P}_0 = \mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}_{L_0}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{P}_0\mathcal{O}_L$$

holds and that

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}_L/\mathfrak{P}}{\mathcal{O}_{L_0}/\mathfrak{P}_0}$$

and

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}_{L_0}/\mathfrak{P}_0}{\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p}}$$

are finite separable extensions, respectively.

Hence,

$$Spec(\mathcal{O}_L)/Spec(\mathcal{O}_{L_0})$$

and

$$Spec(\mathcal{O}_{L_0})/Spec(\mathcal{O}_K)$$

are unramified, respectively. This completes the proof. □

3.2. **Composites.** Let K, L_1, and L_2 be arithmetic function fields over several variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that L_1/K and L_2/K are arithmetically unramified. Then the composite $L_1 \cdot L_2$ of fields is also arithmetically unramified over K.*

Proof. Consider the three pairs

$$(K, \mathcal{O}_K) \subseteq (L_1, \mathcal{O}_{L_1}) \bigcap (L_2, \mathcal{O}_{L_2})$$

of rings of algebraic integers, where

$$\mathcal{O}_{L_1} = \mathcal{O}_K[a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_m];$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{L_2} = \mathcal{O}_K[b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_n].$$

Denote by

$$\mathcal{O}_{L_1} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{L_2}$$

the smallest subring of the field $L_1 \cdot L_2$ that contains the set

$$\{x \cdot y \mid x \in \mathcal{O}_{L_1}, y \in \mathcal{O}_{L_2}\}.$$

Suppose that

$$\phi : \mathcal{O}_{L_1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{L_2} \to \mathcal{O}_{L_1} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{L_2}$$

is the homomorphism of rings given by

$$x_1 \otimes x_2 \mapsto x_1 \cdot x_2.$$

Put

$$\mathcal{O} = \phi(\mathcal{O}_{L_1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{L_2}).$$

By properties of integral closures (see [4]), we have

$$\mathcal{O}_{L_1} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{L_2} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{L_1 \cdot L_2};$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{L_1 \cdot L_2} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K[a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_m, b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_n];$$
$$\mathcal{O}_K[a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_m, b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_n] \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{L_1} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{L_2};$$
$$\mathcal{O}_{L_1} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{L_2} \subseteq \mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K[a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_m, b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_n].$$

Then

$$\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{L_1 \cdot L_2} = \mathcal{O}_{L_1} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{L_2}$$

is the ring of algebraic integers in the field $L_1 \cdot L_2$.

Hence, ϕ is a surjection. It is follows that $Spec(\mathcal{O}_{L_1 \cdot L_2})$ is a closed immersion of the affine scheme $Spec(\mathcal{O}_{L_1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{L_2})$.

Now we have a tower of morphisms of schemes

$$\begin{aligned} &Spec(\mathcal{O}_{L_1 \cdot L_2}) \\ &\to Spec(\mathcal{O}_{L_1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{L_2}) \\ &\cong Spec(\mathcal{O}_{L_1}) \times_{Spec(\mathcal{O}_K)} Spec(\mathcal{O}_{L_2}) \\ &\to Spec(\mathcal{O}_{L_1}) \\ &\to Spec(\mathcal{O}_K). \end{aligned}$$

It is seen that $Spec(\mathcal{O}_{L_1 \cdot L_2})$ is unramified over $Spec(\mathcal{O}_K)$ from the base change of a unramified morphism (see [6]). Hence, the composite $L_1 \cdot L_2$ is arithmetically unramified over K. □

3.3. **Base changes.** Let K and L be two arithmetic function fields over several variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $K' \supseteq K$ be an arithmetic function field over $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$ and let L/K be arithmetically unramified. Then the composite $L' = L \cdot K'$ of fields is also arithmetically unramified over K'.*

Proof. Take the homomorphism

$$\phi : \mathcal{O}_L \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{K'} \to \mathcal{O}_L \cdot \mathcal{O}_{K'}$$

of rings given by

$$x_1 \otimes x_2 \mapsto x_1 \cdot x_2.$$

It is clear that ϕ is a surjection. Put

$$\mathcal{O}_{L'} = \phi(\mathcal{O}_L \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{K'}).$$

Consider the morphisms

$$Spec(\mathcal{O}_{L'}) \to Spec(\mathcal{O}_L) \times_{Spec(\mathcal{O}_K)} Spec(\mathcal{O}_{K'}) \to Spec(\mathcal{O}_{K'})$$

as we have done in *Lemma 3.3*. It is seen that the composite of the two morphisms above is unramified. □

3.4. **The unramified is independent of the choice of variables.** Let K and L be arithmetic function fields over variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let K be an arithmetic function field also over variables $t'_1, t'_2, \cdots, t'_n$. Then L is arithmetically unramified over K relative to variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$ if and only if relative to variables $t'_1, t'_2, \cdots, t'_n$.*

Proof. Assume that L is arithmetically unramified over K relative to variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$. Denote by $\mathcal{O}'_K$ the subring of elements $x \in K$ that are integral over the integral domain $\mathbb{Z}[t'_1, t'_2, \cdots, t'_n]$.

Consider the morphisms

$$Spec(\mathcal{O}_L) \to Spec(\mathcal{O}_L) \times_{Spec(\mathcal{O}_K)} Spec(\mathcal{O}'_K) \to Spec(\mathcal{O}'_K).$$

as we have done in *Lemma 3.3*. By the composite of the two morphisms above, it is seen that $Spec(\mathcal{O}_L)$ is unramified over $Spec(\mathcal{O}'_K)$. □

Remark 3.6. Let L be arithmetically unramified over K. Then it is independent of the choice of variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$ of L over K according to *Lemma 3.5*.

3.5. **The maximal unramified extension.** Now take the maximal arithmetically unramified extension of an arithmetic function field as one does in algebraic number theory. It is twofold. One is for the computation of the étale fundamental group of an arithmetic scheme (see [2]); the other is for unramified class fields of an arithmetic function field in an ideal-theoretic manner (see [3]).

Let L be an arithmetic function field over several variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$. Fixed an algebraic closure Ω of L. Put

- $[L](\Omega)^{au} \triangleq$ the set of all finite arithmetically unramified subextensions of L contained in Ω.
- $(L;\Omega)^{au} \triangleq \lim_{\to_{Z \in [L](\Omega)^{au}}} \lambda_Z(Z)$, i.e., the direct limit of the direct system of rings indexed by $[L](\Omega)^{au}$, where each $\lambda_Z : Z \in [L](\Omega)^{au} \to \Omega$ is the L-embedding.

Here, $[L;\Omega]^{au}$ is taken as a directed set by set inclusion. By *Remark 3.6* it is seen that $(L;\Omega)^{au}$ is well-defined.

The subfield $(L;\Omega)^{au}$ of Ω is called the **maximal arithmetically unramified extension** of L in Ω.

Proposition 3.7. Let $[L](\Omega)^{au}_0$ be the set of all finite arithmetically unramified Galois subextensions of L contained in Ω. Then we have

$$(L;\Omega)^{au} = \lim_{\to_{Z \in [L](\Omega)^{au}_0}} \lambda_Z(Z).$$

Proof. It is immediate from the preliminary fact that $[L](\Omega)^{au}_0$ is a cofinal directed subset of $[L](\Omega)^{au}$. □

Lemma 3.8. *The maximal arithmetically unramified extension of an arithmetic function field is an algebraic Galois extension, which is unique upon isomorphisms of fields. That is, $(L;\Omega)^{au}$ is an algebraic Galois extension of L and there is a natural isomorphism*

$$(L;\Omega)^{au} \cong (L;\Omega')^{au}$$

between fields over L if Ω' is another algebraic closure of L.

Proof. It is immediate from *Proposition 3.7*. □

4. Unramified Extensions of a Purely Transcendental Extension

As well-known, the rational field $\mathbb{Q}$ has a trivial unramified extension (see [9]). In this section we will prove that $\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)$ also has a trivial arithmetically unramified extension. As an immediate application, in §5 it will be sen that the étale fundamental group of the affine scheme $Spec(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n])$ is trivial.

4.1. **Statement of the theorem.** Fixed a finite number of variables $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n$ over $\mathbb{Q}$. For the unramified extensions, we have the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *A purely transcendental extension $\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)$ over $\mathbb{Q}$ has a trivial arithmetically unramified extension. That is, we have*

$$\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) = \mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)^{au}.$$

Remark 4.2. Let $t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n, \cdots$ be an infinite number of (algebraically independent) variables over $\mathbb{Q}$. By *Theorem 4.1* it is seen that

$$\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n, \cdots) = \mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n, \cdots)^{au}.$$

4.2. **Proof of Theorem 4.1.** Now we prove *Theorem 4.1*.

Proof. **(Proof of Theorem 4.1)** Let K be an arithmetically unramified extension of $\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)$. We will proceed in several steps.

Step 1. For the ring of algebraic integers, it is seen that

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)} = \mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]$$

holds according to preliminary facts on integral closures (see [4]).

For a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{P}$ of the ring $\mathcal{O}_K$ of algebraic integers of K, the ideal

$$\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{P} \bigcap \mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]$$

must be a maximal ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]$ since $\mathfrak{p}$ generates $\mathfrak{P}$ in the localizations of the rings. Then it is seen that $Spec(\mathcal{O}_K)/Spec(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n])$ is faithfully flat and hence étale in virtue of preliminary facts on étale morphisms (see [6, 8]).

Step 2. There are a finite number of elements

$$\mu, \cdots, \nu \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)}$$

generating $\mathcal{O}_K$ over $\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n][\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_m].$$

By *Lemmas 5.4-5* suppose

$$K = \mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)[\mu]$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n][\mu]$$

without loss of generality, where $\mu \triangleq \mu_1$ is a non-unit in $\mathcal{O}_K$.

Step 3. Prove that either $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]$ holds or μ is an irreducible element in $\mathcal{O}_K$.

In deed, assume $\mu = \alpha \cdot \beta$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that α is irreducible in $\mathcal{O}_K$. We have

$$(\mu) \subseteq (\alpha)$$

as ideals in $\mathcal{O}_K$. Then there is some $c_1 \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that

$$\mu = c_1 \cdot \alpha.$$

On the other hand, as $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K$, there is a polynomial

$$\phi(X) = X^n + a_{n-1}X^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 X + a_0$$

with coefficients in the ring $\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]$ such that

$$\alpha = \phi(\mu).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= c_1 \cdot \phi(\mu) \\ &= c_1 \cdot (\mu^n + a_{n-1}\mu^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1\mu + a_0) \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\mu \mid a_0$$

or

$$\mu \mid c_1.$$

If $\mu \mid a_0$, we have

$$\mu \in \mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n];$$

moreover, in such a case, we will complete the proof.

If $\mu \mid c_1$, put

$$c_1 = c_2 \cdot \mu$$

with $c_2 \in \mathcal{O}_K$; then

$$\mu = c_2 \cdot \mu \cdot \alpha;$$
$$\alpha = \pm 1,$$

where there will be a contradiction; hence, μ is irreducible in $\mathcal{O}_K$.

Step 4. Suppose μ is an irreducible element in $\mathcal{O}_K$. By *Going-Down Theorem* (see [4]), we have the prime ideals

$$\mathfrak{p} = (t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n, p)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{P} = (t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n, \mu)$$

of A and B, respectively, satisfying

$$\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{P} \bigcap \mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n],$$

where $p \in \mathbb{N}$ is a prime number. This is due to the preliminary fact that the heights of the prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{P}$ are equal.

Consider the localizations of the rings

$$B \triangleq (\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \mathfrak{P})^{-1}\mathcal{O}_K;$$

$$A \triangleq (\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n] \setminus \mathfrak{p})^{-1}\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n] \cong \mathbb{F}_p[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n].$$

It is clear that the ring B is integral over A.

For the generator μ, there are two cases: $u \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ or $u \notin \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.

Step 5. Let μ be irreducible in $\mathcal{O}_K$. Prove that there exists the case that $u \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. Hypothesize

$$\mu \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{Q}}.$$

Put

$$\mathfrak{P}_0 \triangleq (\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \mathfrak{P})^{-1}(\mu) \subseteq (\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \mathfrak{P})^{-1}\mathfrak{P}.$$

Then $\mathfrak{P}_0$ is a prime ideal of the ring B since (μ) is a prime ideal of $\mathcal{O}_K$.

As B is integral over A, from *Going-Down Theorem* we have a polynomial

$$q(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) \in \mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]$$

such that

$$\mathfrak{p}_0 = \mathfrak{P}_0 \bigcap A$$

where

$$\mathfrak{p}_0 \triangleq (\mathbb{Z}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) \setminus \mathfrak{p})^{-1}(q(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n))$$

is a prime ideal of A and $q(X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n)$ is a polynomial with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $q(X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n)$ is irreducible both in A and in $\mathbb{Z}[X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n]$.

Now prove

$$\mu = q(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)$$

or

$$\mu = -q(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n).$$

In fact, according to *Step 1*, *Spec*(B)/*Spec*(A) is étale by the morphism induced from the inclusion map; it follows that $\mathfrak{p}_0$ generates $\mathfrak{P}_0$ in B. Hence we have an element of the form

$$\frac{a(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n, \mu)}{b(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)} \in B$$

such that

$$\mu = \frac{a(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n, \mu)}{b(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)} \cdot q(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)$$

holds, where $a(X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n, Y)$ and $b(X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n)$ are polynomials over $\mathbb{Z}$ in several indeterminates.

Put

$$a(X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n, Y) = \sum_{0 \le i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_n \le l, 0 \le j \le m} a_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_n j} X_1^{i_1} X_2^{i_2} \cdots X_n^{i_n} Y^j$$

such that each coefficient $a_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_n j}$ is contained in $\mathbb{Z}$.

We have

$$\mu = \frac{c(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) + d(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) \cdot \mu}{b(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)} \cdot q(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)$$

where

$$c(X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n) = \sum_{0 \le i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_n \le l, j=0} a_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_n j} X_1^{i_1} X_2^{i_2} \cdots X_n^{i_n};$$

$$d(X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n) = \sum_{0 \le i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_n \le l, j=1} a_{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_n j} X_1^{i_1} X_2^{i_2} \cdots X_n^{i_n}.$$

It is seen that

$$c(X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n) = 0$$

holds since in $\mathcal{O}_K$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & b(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) \cdot \mu \\ & = c(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) q(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) + d(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) q(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) \cdot \mu. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\frac{d(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) \cdot q(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)}{b(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)} = 1.$$

Immediately, we have

$$b(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) \mid d(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)$$

as elements in $\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]$. Set

$$f(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) \triangleq \frac{d(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)}{b(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)}.$$

As $\mu = f(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) \cdot q(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) \cdot \mu$, we must have

$$f(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) \cdot q(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) = 1,$$

which will be in contradiction.

Hence,

$$\mu \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}.$$

Step 6. Let $\mu \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ be irreducible in $\mathcal{O}_K$. We have

$$\mathfrak{p}_0 = \mathfrak{P}_0 \bigcap \mathbb{Z}$$

where $\mathfrak{p}_0 = (p)$ and $\mathfrak{P}_0 = (\mu)$ are prime ideals of $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Z}[\mu]$, respectively.

It is seen that $\mathfrak{p}_0$ generates $\mathfrak{P}_0$ in the localization $(\mathbb{Z}[\mu] \setminus \mathfrak{P}_0)^{-1}\mathbb{Z}[\mu]$ of the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\mu]$ according to preliminary operations on ideals since $\mathfrak{p}$ generates $\mathfrak{P}$ in the ring B and the residue field $B/\mathfrak{P}$ is a finite separable extension of $A/\mathfrak{p}$ from the assumption.

Let p run through all prime numbers in $\mathbb{Z}$. By definition for unramified it is seen the subfield $K_0 = \mathbb{Q}[\mu]$ is unramified over $\mathbb{Q}$, or equivalently, $K_0 = \mathbb{Q}[\mu]$ is arithmetically unramified over $\mathbb{Q}$.

It follows that we must have $\mu = p$ since $\mathbb{Q}$ has a trivial maximal unramified extension (see [9]). Hence,

$$\mu \in \mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n].$$

Now from *Steps 3,6*, it is immediate that

$$K = \mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)$$

holds; then

$$\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n) = \mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)^{au}.$$

This completes the proof. □

5. An application to the étale fundamental group

It will be seen that the maximal arithmetically unramified extension can serve as a computation of the étale fundamental group of an arithmetic scheme (see [1, 2] for a general case). In this section there will be an application of *Theorem 4.1* to the the étale fundamental group of the affine scheme of the ring of integers of a purely transcendental extension over $\mathbb{Q}$.

5.1. **Statement of the theorem.** For a connected scheme Z, let $\pi_1^{et}(Z, s)$ denote the étale fundamental group of Z over a geometric point s of Z. See [5, 6, 8, 10] for the definition and properties of étale fundamental groups.

Theorem 5.1. *$Spec(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n])$ has a trivial étale fundamental group, i.e., there is an isomorphism*

$$\pi_1^{et}(Spec(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]), s) \cong \{0\}$$

of groups, where s is a geometric point of $Spec(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n])$.

We will give the proof of *Theorem 5.1* in §5.4.

5.2. **Recalling the étale fundamental group of a normal scheme.** Let X be a connected normal scheme surjectively over $\mathbb{Z}$ of finite type.

Let $\Omega = \overline{k(X)}$ be an algebraic closure and s a geometric point of X over Ω. As in [1, 2], we put

- $[X;\Omega]_{et} \triangleq$ the set of the pointed covers (Y, s_Y) of (X, s), where Y is an irreducible finite étale Galois cover of X, s_Y is a geometric point of Y over s_ξ, and two such covers $(Y, s_Y), (Z, s_Z)$ of (X, s) are identified with each other in $[X;\Omega]_{et}$ if there is an isomorphism f of Y onto Z over X with $f(s_Y) = s_Z$.

See [5, 6, 10] for definition of finite étale Galois covers. For brevity, we write $Y = (Y, s_Y)$ for a $(Y, s_Y) \in [X;\Omega]_{et}$.

For any $X_\alpha, X_\beta \in [X;\Omega]_{et}$, we say

$$X_\alpha \leq X_\beta$$

if and only if X_β is a finite étale Galois cover over X_α. Then $[X;\Omega]_{et}$ is a directed set with the partial order $\leq$.

Set

- $k(X;\Omega)^{un} \triangleq \lim_{\rightarrow_{Z\in[X;\Omega]_{et}}} \lambda_Z(k(Z))$, i.e., $k(X;\Omega)^{un}$ is the direct limit of the direct system of function fields $k(Z)$ indexed by $[X;\Omega]_{et}$, where each $\lambda_Z : k(Z) \to \Omega$ is the $k(X)$-embedding of fields.

$k(X;\Omega)^{un}$ is said to be the **maximal formally unramified extension** of the arithmetic variety X in Ω (see [1, 2]).

It is easily seen that $k(X;\Omega)^{un}$ is an algebraic Galois extension of $k(X)$.

Here there is a computation of the étale fundamental group of a connected normal scheme.

Proposition 5.2. The étale fundamental group of X is canonically isomorphic to the Galois group of the maximally formally unramified extension of the function field $k(X)$. That is, there is an isomorphism

$$\pi_1^{et}(X, s) \cong Gal\left(k(X;\Omega)^{un}/k(X)\right)$$

of groups in a natural manner.

Proof. See [1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10]. □

5.3. **A computation of the maximally formally unramified extension.** Let X be a connected normal scheme surjectively over $\mathbb{Z}$ of finite type. The function field $k(X)$ of X is an arithmetic function field defined as in §2.

For the function field $k(X)$, put

$$k(X;\Omega)^{au} = (k(X);\Omega)^{au}.$$

Here there is a computation of the maximal formally ramified extension.

Proposition 5.3. The maximal arithmetically unramfied extension $k(X)^{au}$ is equal to the maximal formally ramified extension $k(X)^{un}$. That is, we have

$$k(X;\Omega)^{au} = k(X;\Omega)^{un}$$

as subfields of a given algebraic closure Ω of the function field $k(X)$.

Proof. (See [1, 2]) Write $L = k(X)$. Let $\mathcal{O}_L$ be the ring of algebraic integers of the arithmetic function field L over the specified variables. We have

$$L = k(Spec(\mathcal{O}_L);$$
$$(L;\Omega)^{un} = (k(Spec(\mathcal{O}_L));\Omega)^{un}.$$

Then it suffices to prove

$$(k(Spec(\mathcal{O}_L));\Omega)^{un} = (L;\Omega)^{au}.$$

In fact, we have

$$(L;\Omega)^{au} = \lim_{\rightarrow_{Z\in[L](\Omega)_0^{au}}} \lambda_Z(Z);$$
$$(k(Spec(\mathcal{O}_L));\Omega)^{un} = \lim_{\rightarrow_{X\in[Spec(\mathcal{O}_L);\Omega]_{et}}} \lambda_X(k(X)).$$

On the other hand, put

$$\Sigma = \{k(X) \mid X \in [Spec(\mathcal{O}_L);\Omega]_{et}\}.$$

Then Σ is a directed set, where the partial order is given by set inclusion.

As $Spec(\mathcal{O}_L)$ is a normal scheme, it is easily seen that each $X \in [Spec(\mathcal{O}_L);\Omega]_{et}$ is normal from preliminary facts on étale covers (see [6, 8]). Then $[L](\Omega)_0^{au}$ is a cofinal directed subset of Σ. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&(k(Spec(\mathcal{O}_L));\Omega)^{un}\\
&= \lim_{\rightarrow_{X\in[Spec(\mathcal{O}_L);\Omega]_{et}}} \lambda_X(k(X))\\
&= \lim_{\rightarrow_{Z\in\Psi[Spec(\mathcal{O}_L)]}} \lambda_Z(Z)\\
&= \lim_{\rightarrow_{Z\in[L](\Omega)_0^{au}}} \lambda_Z(Z)\\
&= (L;\Omega)^{au}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

5.4. **Proof of the main theorem.** Now we can prove *Theorem 5.1.*

Proof. (**Proof of *Theorem 5.1***) Let Ω be an algebraic closure of the arithmetic function field $k(Spec(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]) = \mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)$. Take a geometric point s of $Spec(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n])$ over Ω. Then there are natural isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi_1^{et}(Spec(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]), s)\\
&\cong Gal(k(Spec(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]);\Omega)^{un}/k(X))\\
&\cong Gal(k(Spec(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n]);\Omega)^{au}/k(X))\\
&\cong Gal(\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)^{un}/\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n))\\
&\cong Gal(\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n)/\mathbb{Q}(t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_n))\\
&\cong \{0\}
\end{aligned}$$

between groups from *Propositions 5.2-3, Theorem 4.1.* □

References

[1] An, F-W. On the étale fundamental groups of arithmetic schemes. eprint arXiv:0910.4646.
[2] An, F-W. A computation of étale fundamental groups of arithmetic schemes: special cases. preprint.
[3] An, F-W. On the unramified class fields of an arithmetic function field in several variables. preprint.
[4] Bourbaki, N. Algèbre Commutative. Ch 5 à 7. Springer, Berlin, 2006.
[5] Freitag, E; Kiehl, R. Étale Cohomology and the Weil Conjecture. Springer, Berlin, 1988.
[6] Grothendieck, A; Raynaud, M. Revêtements *É*tales et Groupe Fondamental (SGA1). Springer, New York, 1971.
[7] Lang, S. Unramified Class Field Theory Over Function Fields in Several Variables. Annals of Math, 2nd Ser., Vol 64, No. 2 (1956), 285-325.
[8] Milne, J. Étale Cohomology. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1980.
[9] Neukirch, J. Algebraic Number Theory. Springer, Berlin, 1999.
[10] Szamuely, T. Galois Groups and Fundamental Groups. Cambridge University Press, NY, 2009.

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan, Hubei 430072, People's Republic of China

E-mail address: fwan@amss.ac.cn